

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goto in view of Ando, as applied to claims 5 and 10, and further in view of Hirono. Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ando in view of Ofek. Applicant respectfully asserts that the applied references, whether taken separately or in combination with each other, do not teach or suggest the invention currently recited in the pending claims. Accordingly, these rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 9

Independent claims 1 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Goto. With regard to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied Goto reference does not teach or suggest the claimed navigation system combination including at least “a map data reading device for accessing one of the memory devices, which is selected in accordance with a predetermined condition”. Similarly, with regard to independent claim 9, Applicant respectfully submits that Goto does not teach or suggest the claimed navigation system combination including at least “a map data reading device for selecting one of said first and second memory devices in accordance with a predetermined condition, accessing the selected one of said first and second memory devices and reading out the map data required for the navigation operation therefrom.”

The Office Action cites to the abstract and cols. 2, line 64 – col. 3, line 14 for these teachings. These portions of Goto disclose a vehicle-carried navigation system in which map data is stored in a map data storage apparatus 2, disclosed as, for example, a CD-ROM. This system also includes a current position detecting apparatus 5 and a picture drawing apparatus 6. Each of the current position detecting apparatus 5 and a picture drawing apparatus 6 includes a

map data memory 51 and 61, respectively. Map data memories 51 and 61 are provided to store map data read out from the map data storage apparatus 2. Changing over means 3 or a judging device is provided to select between one of apparatus 5 and 6, depending on which apparatus will read data from the map data storage apparatus.

As disclosed at col. 2, lines 57-63, if requests for reading out of map data are received simultaneously from both the current position detecting apparatus 5 and a picture drawing apparatus 6, a priority is provided to the current position detecting apparatus by the changing over means 3 so that the current position detecting apparatus 5 reads out map data from the map data storage apparatus.

Thus, while Goto does disclose map data memories 51 and 61 separate from the main map data storage apparatus 2, Applicant respectfully submits that each of these memories 51 and 61 store map data received from the main map data storage apparatus 2. Moreover, once this map data is stored in either of the memories 51 and 61, it is used exclusively within its respective apparatus 5 or 6. As a result, there is no “map data reading device” provided which accesses one of a plurality of memory devices, which is selected in accordance with a predetermined condition, as recited in claims 1 and 9.

As discussed at least at pages 3-4 of the instant specification, the navigation system arrangement of the instant invention provides a plurality of memory devices, each of which stores map data and a map data reading device which reads out the stored map data from one or all of the memory devices. The navigation system can access the optimum memory device depending on a “predetermined condition”, as recited in claims 1 and 9, from among the plurality

of memory devices to ensure proper navigation operation. See also page 34, line 15- page 35, line 3; and page 40, line 25 to page 41, line 3.

Independent claim 17

Independent claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Ando and Ofek. Applicant respectfully submits that this same combination rejection was applied against claim 17 in the previous Office Action. Moreover, in response to the traversal of this rejection as filed in the previous Response on March 4, 2002, the Examiner stated that the arguments were deemed to be persuasive. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With regard to independent claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references do not teach or suggest the claimed navigation system combination including at least the first and second memory devices, each capable of reading out map data which is recorded therein and a map data reading device for accessing one of the memory devices, which is selected in accordance differential management information, and reading out map data required for the navigation operation therefrom.

The previous Office Action conceded at page 3 that Ando does not “clearly mention a first and second memory device”. However, the latest Office Action now alleges that Ando teaches a first memory device at col. 5, lines 4-33 and a second memory device of a non volatile type at col. 3, line 43 to col. 4, line 10. Upon our review of Ando, we propose arguing that there is no teaching or suggestion of a navigation system combination having first and second memory devices, as recited in claim 17.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Ofek fails to cure the deficiencies of Ando. Moreover, Applicant traverses the Office Action's interpretation of Ofek for at least the following reasons. Ofek is directed to a system for migrating data between first and second data storage systems while the database is open and in real-time, allegedly completely transparent to the host or data processing unit. Such a system helps to ensure that a data processing center of a business or organization such as banks, airlines, and insurance companies, are able to continually access data, even during the upgrading of the data storage systems. While Ofek discusses "map data," it is referring to indexing of data within a database, but not "map data" as contemplated by the instant invention with regard to a navigation system. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Ofek is directed to a different technical field than the navigation system disclosed in Ando.

The instant invention, on the other hand, as recited in at least claim 17, provides a navigation system combination including first and second memory devices, each capable of reading out map data which is recorded therein. Further, the map data is read by a "map data reading device" from one of these memory devices. The appropriate memory device is selected in accordance with differential management information.

In view of the above discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references, whether taken separately, or in any combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest at least the particularly-recited features of independent claims 1, 9 and 17. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 9 and 17 are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) are respectfully requested. Moreover, claims 2-8 are dependent on independent claim 1 and claims 10-16 are dependent on